



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09-448,277	11-24-1999	WOONG SIK CHOI	8733.20015	4859
30827	7590	06-18-2002		
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 1900 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006			EXAMINER	QI, ZHI QIANG
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/448,277	CHOI, WOONG SIK
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mike Qi	2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3-6,9-12,14-18 and 20-22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 2,7,8,13 and 19 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,226,057 (Lee).

Claims 1 and 12, Lee discloses (col. 3, line 45 – col.7, line 45; Figs.2A and 2B) a liquid crystal display device comprising:

- substrate (12);
- first and second gate lines (14m, 14m-1) formed on the substrate (12);
- first and second source bus lines (data lines) (22n-1, 22n) intersecting the first and second gate lines (14m, 14m-1) so as to define a pixel region, wherein each of the first data line (22n-1) and the second data line (22n) has longitudinally

separated first and second regions (i.e., the data lines are overlapped by the pixel electrode 26n);

- insulating film (28) covering the first and the second gate lines (14m, 14m-1) and the first and the second data lines (22n-1, 22n);
- pixel electrode (26n) disposed in the pixel region, the pixel electrode (26n) overlapping a region of the first data line (22n-1), the pixel electrode (26n) overlapping a region of the second data lines (22n);
- switching element (TFT, T1) disposed in the pixel region and connected between the second gate line (14m-1) and the pixel electrode (26n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4-6, 10-11, 15-17 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of US 5,757,444 (Takemura).

Claims 5 and 16, Takemura discloses (col.6, lines 48-67; Fig.4) that the signal to be applied to the data lines Ym and Ym+1 have the same pulse height and opposite polarity (alternating current driving method), and thus affection of these data lines on the picture-element electrode (pixel electrode) is mutually offset. Takemura indicates that as

a result, there occurs no cross-talk which would be induced by the coupling between the data line and the picture-element electrode (pixel electrode).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use an alternating current driving method as claimed in claims 5 and 16 for suppressing the cross-talk phenomenon.

Claims 4, 10, 15, and 21, Takemura discloses (col.7, lines 41-45) that the overlap between the picture-element electrode and the data line is also symmetrical between right and left side (i.e., the first and the second regions, the right side and the left side overlapping regions, are approximately the same), and by proper performing the alternation of the data line as described above, the cross-talk is completely removed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to arrange the first and the second region are approximately the same as claimed in claims 4, 10, 15 and 21 for removing the cross-talk.

Claims 6, 11, 17 and 22, Lee discloses (col.4, lines 30-34; Fig.2A) that the pixel electrode (26n) are beyond the adjacent source bus lines (data lines) arranged at left and right sides thereof and then extended to edges of the adjacent pixel electrodes in row direction, i.e., the pixel electrode extends over the date lines.

5. Claims 3, 9, 14, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Takemura as applied to claims 1,12, 4-6, 10-11,15-17 and 21-22 above.

Claims 3, 9, 14 and 20, using reflective pixel electrode in a reflection type LCD was common and known in the art as employing high reflective material such as

aluminum as the pixel electrode for achieving thin and light-weight and low electricity consuming.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use reflective pixel electrode as claimed in claims 3, 9, 14 and 20 for achieving low electricity consuming.

Claim 18, Lee discloses (col.4, lines 30-34; Fig.2A) that the pixel electrode (26n) are beyond the adjacent source bus lines (data lines) arranged at left and right sides thereof and then extended to edges of the adjacent pixel electrodes in row direction, i.e., the pixel electrode extends over the date lines.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 2, 7-8,13 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art of record neither teaches nor discloses that a liquid crystal display device comprises various elements, more specifically, as the following:

the pixel electrode overlaps the first and second data lines by whole width of the data lines and by a substantially one-half length of each one of the first and second the data lines [claims 2, 7-8,13 and 19].

The closest reference US 6,226,057 (Lee) discloses (Fig.2A) that the pixel electrode (26n) overlaps the first and the second data lines (22n-1, 22n) by whole width of the data lines, but it does not teach that the pixel electrode overlaps the data lines by

a substantially one-half length of the data lines. The claim 7 is dependent on the claim 2, so that the claims 2 and 7 contain the subject matter described above.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on Apr.24, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's only arguments are as follows:

1) The reference Lee does not teach or suggest a pixel electrode overlapping one of the first and second regions of the first data line, and overlapping one of the first and second data line.

Examiner's responses to Applicant's only arguments are as follows:

1) In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., According to the specification page 5, lines 10-15, an area of the pixel electrode overlapped between the pixel electrode and the first data line is substantially the same area as the pixel electrode overlapped between the pixel electrode and the second data line, and each of the overlapped areas substantially cover one-half length of the data lines) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See

In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The reference Lee discloses (Fig.2A) the pixel electrode (26n) overlapping a region of the first data line (22n-1), the pixel electrode (26n) overlapping a region of the

second data lines (22n). The term "region" has a broad meanings and the claim does not indicate the size of the first region and the second region and how to define the first region and the second region. The first region or the second region is a region in the data line, so that the reference Lee met the limitations in the claims.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Qi whose telephone number is (703) 308-6213. The examiner can normally be reached on 349.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Sikes can be reached on (703) 308-4842. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7721 for regular communications and (703) 308-7721 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Mike Qi
June 5, 2002


TOANTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER